CENTRAL FAX CENTER APR 1 2 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0651-0031

Under the Pag	erwork Re	duction Act of 1995	. no persons	U.S s are required to respond to a	i. Patent and I collection of inf	racemark ormation :	unice; u inless it:	displays a valid OMB control number.			
TRANSMITTAL			Application Number		10/691,555						
			Filing Date	10/24/2003	10/24/2003						
FORM				First Named Inventor	David C Lo	David C Lovetro					
				Art Unit	1746						
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filling)			Examiner Name	Carrillo, Bi	Carrillo, Bibi Sharidan						
				Attorney Docket Number	000600-01	000800-016					
Total Number of Pages In This Subtrastion											
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC											
Fee Attached Amendment/Repty After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request		Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s) Landscape Table on	tion tion tion to Convert to a visional Application rer of Attorney, Revocation ringe of Correspondence Address minal Disclaimer		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below): Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (transmittal and 3 pages accompanying arguments)						
	e Applicate to Mi	tion ssing Parts FR 1.52 or 1.53	TUDE 6	OF A DRI ICANT. ATT	OBNEY (3B 4C	ENIT				
Fin None	1			OF APPLICANT, ATT	UKNEY,	JK AG	ENI				
Firm Name	WHITE,	REDWAY & R	OWN LLP								
Signature		VI	~								
Printed name	DAVID.	SERBIN									
Date 04/12/2006				Reg. No.	30,589)					
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on											
Signature											
Typed or printed name DAVID J SERBIN							Date	04/12/2006			

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

APR 1 2 2006

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

APK 1 Z 2U00

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x, OMB 0651-00x

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unlass it displays a valid OMB control number.

		Docket Number (C	optional)					
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVI								
facsimile transmitted to	,	000600	-016					
I hereby cartify that this correspondence is being deposited with the	Application N		Filed .					
United States Poetal Sociles with sufficient postage as first class mail- in an envelope addressed to "Mail Step AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	10/691,555 10/24/2003							
on April 12, 2006	First Named Inventor							
Signature David	David C. Lovetro							
/	Art Unit		xaminer					
Typed or printed DAVID J SERBIN	174	16	Carrillo, Bibi					
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.								
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.								
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.								
		Λ.	11-1					
l am the	*	117	J 1					
applicant/inventor.		2000 3/1	<u>w</u>					
gestings of record of the entire interest		~	Signature					
assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.		DAVID 1						
(Form PTO/SB/96)		Typed	or printed name					
attorney or agent of record. 30, 589	<u>-</u> · ——	703 29 Telep	90035					
_		ı exeț	MIGHE HUMBER					
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.		04/12	12006					
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34	_		Date					
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.								
*Total of forms are submitted.								

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.8. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 1 2 2006

In re Patent Application of

Attorney Docket No. 000600-016

David C. Lovetro

Confirmation No. 7490

Application No. 10/691,555

Group Art Unit: 1746

Filed: October 24, 2003

Examiner: Bibi Sharidan Carrillo

For: CHEMICAL COMPOSITION AND

METHOD

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellants request a review of the Final Rejection mailed December 12, 2005 in view of the following remarks.

Patent

p. 5

Attorney's Docket No. 000600-016

REMARKS

Reference is made to appellants' response to the Final Rejection filed March 21, 2006,

and specifically to the arguments beginning on page 7, line 12 wherein the rejections are

discussed.

The claimed invention relates to a method for cleaning metals. One of the primary

references cited by the Examiner is Brasch, U.S. Patent No. 4378270. Brasch relates to a method

of etching copper, and is specifically directed to a post etching method and composition which

aids in the recovery of copper from the spent etching solution.

The cleaning of metals is fundamentally different from the etching of metals, as

appellants point out in their specification at page 3, lines 22-24. Etching is the purposeful

removal of metal from the substrate surface. By contrast, a cleaning process does not remove

significant amounts of metal from the substrate, only impurities at the substrate surface. This

fundamental difference between etching and cleaning is so well known that it hardly requires

supporting extrinsic evidence. Nevertheless, from Webster's II New College Dictionary,

Houghton Mifflin Co. (1995), come the following definitions:

Etching: To cut into the surface of by the action of acid...

Cleaning: To rid of dirt; to free of impurities...

In her Final Rejection, the Examiner, against all objective evidence, concludes that

etching and cleaning are equivalent. She then uses this "equivalency" as a basis for applying

Brasch, either alone or in combination with other references. Clearly the rejections based on

Brasch are not proper and are without basis, since there is no teaching in Brasch of cleaning a

metal, as claimed by appellants.

2

Àpr 12 2006 21:41

p.6

Patent Attorney's Docket No. 000600-016

The Examiner also rejects the claims based on newly cited primary reference Sugihara et al., U.S. Patent No. 5705089. Sugihara et al. is even further afield, since it lacks any mention of treating metals of any sort. This reference is instead directed to the cleaning of a semiconductor substrate. Furthermore, as the Examiner readily admits, Sugihara et al. "fails to teach the claimed concentration of phosphonic acid." So, not only does Sugihara et al. fail to teach the cleaning of metals, it fails to teach appellants' claimed cleaning composition used in the method. To allege a prima facie case of obviousness, therefore, the Examiner must imagine the skilled artisan using a composition different from Sugihara et al. for a purpose different from Sugihara et al. (i.e., cleaning of metals.)

Clearly the rejections based on Sugihara et al., either alone or in combination, are not proper and are without basis, since there is no teaching in Sugihara et al. of cleaning a metal, using a composition as claimed by appellants.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 503015.

1217 King Street Alexandria, VA 22314 (703) 299-0035 telephone (703) 299-0036 facsimile

Date: April 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

WHITE, REDWAY & BROWN LLP

David J. Serbin

Registration No. 30,589